

NOV 27 2006

Attorney Docket No.: 42.P17650  
Application No.: 10/676,894  
Page 6

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11, 13-15 and 17-21 are pending upon after amendment. Claims 12, 16, and 22 have been canceled.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2; rejected claims 7-10, 12, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim; rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Lee; rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-12, 14, 17, 18, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Kim; and stated that claims 4, 13, 15, 16, and 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The amendments to claims 6 and 9 obviate their § 112, ¶2 rejections.

The incorporation of the subject matter from allowable claim 16 into independent claim 14 should render all of claims 14, 15, 17, and 18 allowable.

Similarly, the incorporation of the subject matter from allowable claim 22 into independent claim 19 should render all of claims 19-21 allowable.

Regarding claims 1-6, Applicants have added subject matter to claim 1 that is similar to that indicated as allowable in canceled claim 16. Thus, Applicants respectfully suggest that the incorporation of such subject matter also renders claims 1-6 allowable. In any event, no reasonable combination of Lee and Kim teaches or suggests a device including a parallel advanced technology attachment interface including a plurality of predefined lines, and wake circuitry to provide a notification signal on an interrupt request line of the plurality of predefined lines, as set forth in claims 1-6 as amended.

Regarding claims 7-11 and 13, the subject matter of canceled claim 12 has been incorporated into independent claim 7, which requires a method including, *inter alia*, "querying the optical drive for a context of the wake event; and receiving the context of the wake event from the optical drive." The combination of Lee and Kim fails to teach or suggest all limitations of claim 7 as amended.

Attorney Docket No.: 42.P17650

Application No.: 10/676,894

Page 7

Pages 4 and 8 of the Office Action allege (with respect to canceled claim 12) that the claimed querying and receiving are taught or suggested by Kim at Fig. 1, step 150; col. 2, lines 35-37; and/or col. 3, lines 9-14.

As taught at col. 3, lines 9-14, which describe step 150, however, this step involves comparing an input command to a command stored in memory 22. First, memory 22 is a memory in a system, and does not reasonably teach or suggest "querying the optical drive" as required by claim 7 as amended. See col. 2, lines 25-43, which describe a system controller 21, a memory 22, a power supply 23, and a servo unit 24, only the last of which reasonably corresponds to the claimed "optical drive."

Second, the mere comparison of two input commands does not reasonably teach or suggest querying for "a context of the wake event" as claimed. The comparison taught by Kim produces a binary, equal/not-equal type result, which is not a "context of a wake event" as the phrase is typically understood by those of ordinary skill in the art. In other words, a binary match/not-match result disclosed by Kim provides no additional information about a wake event, much less its "context" as claimed.

Third, because memory 22 is not reasonably part of an optical drive, and because a the comparison of commands is not reasonably a context of a wake event, Kim also fails to teach or suggest "receiving the context of the wake event from the optical drive" as set forth in amended claim 7.

Because the combination of Lee and Kim fails to teach or suggest all limitations of claims 7-11 and 13, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. The § 103(a) rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 1-11, 13-15 and 17-21 are respectfully requested.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Alan Pedersen-Giles at the number below to discuss such matters.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

*Attorney Docket No.: 42.P17650*

*Application No.: 10/676,894*

*Page 8*

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0221 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 27, 2006



Alan Pedersen-Giles

Registration No. 39,996

c/o Intel Americas  
LF2  
4040 Lafayette Center Drive  
Chantilly, VA 20151  
(703) 633-1061